



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE EFFECT OF ENCLITICS ON THE ACCENT OF WORDS IN LATIN

BY CHARLES B. NEWCOMER  
University of Michigan

Much confusion and inconsistency are to be found in the rules of modern Latin grammars regarding the accent of words joined with the enclitics *-que*, *-ne*, etc. Some follow the ancient grammarians blindly; others in certain respects only; yet others in still different regards. The ancients agree in demanding that the syllable preceding a monosyllabic enclitic should be accented: *amārēque*, *bellāque*, *bel-lūmque*, *līmināque*, *itāque*. But exceptions are given: *dēinde*, *dēnique*, *ūndique*, *ūtique*, *itaque* ("therefore"), etc. They disagree, however, in some particulars; cf. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, I. 433; II. 181; III. 466, 477, 488, 521; IV. 427, 436; V. 130; VII. 361.

Priscian (K. III. 520): *Necessitas pronuntiationis regulam corrumpit, ut puta si quis dicat in primis doctus, addat que coniunctionem, dicatque doctusque, in pronuntiatione accentum mutavit, cum non in secunda syllaba, sed in prima accentum habere debuit.*

Pompeius (K. V. 131): *Pronuntiatio frequenter corrumpit <regulam accentuum>, ut puta doctus. quae syllaba habet accentum? doc-, quoniam prior syllaba semper habet accentum. ultima enim numquam habet aut in versu aut in prosa. adde illi coniunctionem, et vides quoniam prior syllaba perdet accentum, puta "doctusque Palaemon." iam incipit non in doc- esse accentus, sed in -tus; ecce ultima syllaba habebit accentum . . . sed forte dicas mihi "sed positio corrumpit, non accessus istarum partium." etiam si positio non accederet, tamen corrumpetur accentus. puta Musa, mu- habet accentum; adde illi istas partes, et corrumpitur, Musāne Musāve Musāque Musāce: ecce illa quae est brevis ultima ipsa habet accentum.*

Allen and Greenough 12, *a*, Harkness 17, 1, Bennett, 6, 3 and 6, Kühner 57, 4, follow the ancients for the most part. Ellendt-Seyffert 6, 3 gives *itāque*, *corporāque*; but *mūsaque*, *bēllaque*. Gildersleeve-Lodge 15, 2, Rem. 1 gives *lūmināque* (two primary accents?); *egōmet*, *amārēve* (in accordance with the grammarians); "but it is more likely that the ordinary system of accentuation was followed." Lane 93 gives *vidēsne*, *Latiōque*; but *periculāque* as probable; other cases

according to the regular penultimate rule 86; no example given like *béllaque*. Hale and Buck 32, 2. N. give preference to *bónaque*, *ítaque* (in both meanings), *bonóque*; but *límínaque* for the Augustan period. Brugmann (*Grund.* I<sup>2</sup>, 976), without the most cogent reasoning, finally decides in favor of *sceleráque* and *armáque*.

The Latin language changed materially during its long history. There was no *Académie* to set a standard. Each writer could speak only for his own period. The grammarians, who follow Greek models, are all post-classical. Their accumulated heap of grammatical rubbish needs sifting. Such statements as do not represent at least a silver Latinity should be stricken from our school grammars. In case the evidence is conflicting, unconvincing, or lacking, the fact should be noted.

Although in all probability the Latin accent was mainly one of stress rather than of pitch, it seems to have been comparatively weak. Hence when it conflicted with the metrical ictus, it could be the more easily disregarded. But accentual or semi-accentual poetry seems to have existed among the common people even in the Augustan age, and even in classical Latin verse in certain cases (as in the last part of the dactylic hexameter) conflict between ictus and accent was carefully avoided. After the third century A. D. the accent exerted a stronger and stronger influence upon versification, until in the Middle Ages the quantitative Latin verse was quite supplanted by the accentual.<sup>1</sup>

This same position was held by Quintilian, as is shown by the following, i. 5. 28:

Evenit, ut metri quoque condicio mutet accentum, ut *Pecudes pictaeque volucres*; nam *volúcrés* mediā accutā legam, quia, etsi naturā brevis, tamen positio longa est, ne faciat iambum, quem non recipit versus herous.

Ancient Latin words had a stressed accent on the first syllable. A survival of this accent is found in the native Latin Saturnian verse and in Plautus in such words as *fácilius*, *cápitibus*. Cf. Vergil's trissyllabic *áriete*, *ábiete*. There is evidence that in early and classical Latin the accent of words joined with an enclitic (*-que*) was not shifted by reason of the atonic appendage. Lindsay (*Amer. Jour. Phil.* XIV, 311) among others advocates the accentual theory of the Saturnian verse. He lets each verse begin with an accent: *Pléríque* 113, *Sésēque* 119. But in accordance with both theories, the second portion of the verse regularly begins with an accent: *Naéviō poētae*.

<sup>1</sup> Hale in Lane 2548. Cf. Goodell, *Chapters on Greek Metric*, p. 165.

Consequently I believe that the following final half-verses illustrate the normal word-accent of the early period:

- ópidesque obdoúcit, *Scrip. epit.* 5.  
 véstemque citrósam, *Naev. (Bährens)* 10.  
 mágnique Atlántes, *Naev. (Bährens)* 20.  
 béllique inértes, *Naev. (Bährens)* 23.  
 mágnamque vexárant, *Naev. (Bährens)* 50.

Similar evidence may be found in Plautus. Lindsay cites the following words, which are thus accented in accordance with the verse ictus: *prósperēqu[e éveniunt]*, *Pseud.* 574; *ōtiōsēqu[e]*, *Poen.* 545; *aúrūmqu[e]*, *Poen.* 767; *surrúptasqu[e]*, *Poen.* 1101; *libertátique*, *Poen.* 1218; *ingénuasqu[e]*, *Poen.* 1345. Evidence pointing in the same direction is not lacking for the classical period. Professor M. W. Humphreys "Influence on Accent in Latin Dactylic Hexameters," *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* IX (1878), pp. 39-58, gives for Vergil twenty cases of so-called *synapheia*: fifteen verses ending like *calórem[que| Inter]* and five like *tótas[que|]*. It seems evident that the word-accent here coincides with the verse-ictus (*calóremque*), whether *-que* be elided or slurred. Luchs has shown (*Comm. Pros.*, cited by Skutsch, *Plaut. Pros.* p. 9<sup>2</sup>) that tribrach words never, dactylic words seldom, take accent on the penult. An investigation of the dramatists shows that tribrach words ending in an enclitic (*ítaque itane satine*) invariably conform to this law. They usually accent the first syllable, but are also found *in arsi* with the ultima elided. *Ítaque* "therefore" is not distinguishable from *ítaque* "and . . . so" by any accentual difference. Dactylic words (*péctore ármaque*) are very rarely accented on the penult in the first foot of iambic verse in the dramatists, but less rarely in anapests (Seneca). Dactylic words ending in an enclitic conform to the same law, accenting the first syllable: *ármaque*, *béllaque*.

Corssen, Humphreys, and other writers have investigated the relationship of word-accent to verse-ictus. All agree that a conflict of accent and ictus in the fifth foot of dactylic hexameter is extremely rare. In Vergil there is less than one in two hundred ( $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.) or sixty-five cases in all. Now if such words as *ármaque* were pronounced *armáque*, as the ancient grammarians would claim for their time, Vergil would not so freely have placed them in the fifth foot, which

demands the accent *armaque*. But in fact he uses them much oftener in the fifth foot than in any other, though he uses them with perfect freedom in the first foot, as Cornu has pointed out (*Verh. der 43. Vers.*, p. 156). In the article cited above Humphreys gives one hundred and fifteen cases in Vergil like *promissaque barba* as hexameter endings and sixteen like *liminaque alta*. In spite of this evidence grammarians are loath to accent *liminaque*, *sceleraque*, though *facilius* and *capitibus* pass unchallenged. Since there is universal testimony for the form *sceleráque* in late Latin, it seems to me almost certain that a secondary accent was developed on the syllable preceding the enclitic *sceleríque* (cf. *ἄνθρωποι τε*), as Lane and others suggest. At a later period, when vowel-quantity grew less important and the accent became a more important element of the word, this secondary accent became the primary one: *scèleráque*, *sceleráque*. This latter change was greatly facilitated by such forms as *scelerúmque*, *sceleríque*, in which the penultimate law would be an operative factor. After the accent *sceleráque* became regular, there might well follow by analogy *itáque itáne bonáque*, pyrrhic words with an enclitic added. *Belláque* would arise from analogy with both the preceding cases, while *bellúmque* would resist the analogy still less on account of the long penult, which would tend to take the accent according to the penultimate law.

My conclusion therefore is that for the classical period we should accent *pléraque*, *ítaque*, *béllaque*, *scéleraque*; but, probably, *bellúmque* *scelerúmque*.